

Extension Integrated Pest Management Coordination and Support Program

FY 2011 Request for Applications

APPLICATION DEADLINE: March 29, 2011



U.S. Department of Agriculture

National Institute of Food and Agriculture

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

EXTENSION INTEGRATED PEST MANAGEMENT COORDINATION AND SUPPORT PROGRAM

INITIAL ANNOUNCEMENT

CATALOG OF FEDERAL DOMESTIC ASSISTANCE: This program is listed in the Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance under **10.500**.

DATES: Applications must be received by close of business (COB) on **March 29, 2011** (5:00 p.m. Eastern Time). Applications received after this deadline will normally not be considered for funding. Comments regarding this request for applications (RFA) are requested within six months from the issuance of this notice. Comments received after that date will be considered to the extent practicable.

STAKEHOLDER INPUT: The National Institute of Food and Agriculture (NIFA) is requesting comments regarding this RFA from any interested party. These comments will be considered in the development of the next RFA for the program, if applicable, and will be used to meet the requirements of section 103(c)(2) of the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 (7 U.S.C. 7613(c)(2)). This section requires the Secretary to solicit and consider input on a current RFA from persons who conduct or use agricultural research, education and extension for use in formulating future RFAs for competitive programs. Written stakeholder comments on this RFA should be submitted in accordance with the deadline set forth in the DATES portion of this Notice.

Written stakeholder comments should be submitted by mail to: Policy and Oversight Division; Office of Extramural Programs; National Institute of Food and Agriculture; USDA; STOP 2299; 1400 Independence Avenue, SW; Washington, DC 20250-2299; or via e-mail to: RFP-OEP@nifa.usda.gov. (This e-mail address is intended only for receiving comments regarding this RFA and not requesting information or forms.) In your comments, please state that you are responding to the Extension Integrated Pest Management Coordination and Support Program RFA.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: NIFA anticipates the availability of funds and requests applications for the Extension Integrated Pest Management Coordination and Support Program (EIPM-CS) for fiscal year (FY) 2011. This program provides support for two components, the *COORDINATION* and *SUPPORT* components. Both components support state and local contributions in advancing the goals of the National Roadmap for Integrated Pest Management (IPM) (www.nifa.usda.gov/nea/pest/in_focus/ipm_if_roadmap.html) by addressing priority needs associated with the coordination, design, development, implementation, and evaluation of extension IPM programs. *SUPPORT* projects should also advance regional issues of shared importance. Through training, EIPM-CS projects help pest managers gain confidence in alternative pest management practices. All EIPM-CS efforts are intended to contribute to the achievement of National IPM goals through the demonstration and evaluation of IPM practices in

production agriculture and other settings. Awards are intended to provide support for programs that strengthen the ability of NIFA and its partner institutions to actively address local, state, and national IPM needs delivered through the Cooperative Extension Services and rapidly respond to new issues and opportunities.

Successful proposals will demonstrate effective efforts by extension educators and implementation of IPM practices by end users. The amount made available for EIPM-CS under this announcement in FY 2011 is anticipated to be approximately \$1.3 million. This RFA is being released prior to the passage of an Appropriations Act for FY 2011. Enactment of additional Continuing Resolutions or an Appropriations Act may affect the availability or level of funding for this program.

In 2010 NIFA anticipated making all awards for three years. However several institutions applied for only one year of funding. There are 45 awards being funded in 2011 with continuation of their 2010 awards. Any institution that received an award in 2010 with a continuation through 2011 is not eligible for a new Coordination award through this program in 2011. Eligibility for the 2011 Coordination awards will be a pool of the seven 1862 institutions with expiring FY 2010 funding in addition to UDC, the 1890 institutions other than 2010 awardee Florida A&M, and any territories not funded in 2010 (all but Puerto Rico and Guam). New Coordination awards in 2011 are expected to be granted for a two year award duration, effectively placing all institutional Extension IPM programs on the same funding cycle. In FY 2011, *SUPPORT* projects within EIPM – CS will advance the goals of the National Roadmap for IPM (nifa.usda.gov/nea/pest/in_focus/ipm_if_roadmap.html) by supporting projects to address development of extension multi-state small farms IPM working groups; and Extension development for critical IPM issues. No more than one *EIPM-CS SUPPORT* application will be accepted from each eligible institution. In FY 2011, NIFA anticipates making one extension multi-state small farms IPM working group award and up to three critical IPM issues awards. Approximately \$1 million will be awarded for EIPM-CS *COORDINATION* programs and up to \$300,000 will be awarded for EIPM-CS *SUPPORT* projects.

This notice identifies the objectives for EIPM-CS proposals, the eligibility criteria for programs and applicants, and the application forms and associated instructions needed to apply for an EIPM-CS award.

Table of Contents

PART I—FUNDING OPPORTUNITY DESCRIPTION	5
A. Legislative Authority and Background	5
B. Purpose and Priorities	8
C. Project Types.....	9
PART II—AWARD INFORMATION	18
A. Available Funding.....	18
B. Types of Applications	18
C. Program Components.....	18
PART III—ELIGIBILITY INFORMATION.....	22
A. Eligible Applicants	22
B. Cost Sharing or Matching	22
PART IV—APPLICATION AND SUBMISSION INFORMATION.....	23
A. Electronic Application Package.....	23
B. Content and Form of Application Submission.....	24
C. Submission Dates and Times	28
D. Funding Restrictions	28
E. Other Submission Requirements.....	28
PART V—APPLICATION REVIEW REQUIREMENTS	30
A. General.....	30
B. Evaluation Criteria	30
C. Conflicts of Interest and Confidentiality.....	33
D. Organizational Management Information.....	33
PART VI—AWARD ADMINISTRATION	34
A. General.....	34
B. Award Notice	34
C. Administrative and National Policy Requirements.....	35
D. Expected Program Outputs and Reporting Requirements	36
PART VII—AGENCY CONTACT	37
PART VIII—OTHER INFORMATION.....	38
A. Access to Review Information.....	38
B. Use of Funds; Changes	38
C. Confidential Aspects of Applications and Awards.....	39
D. Regulatory Information.....	39
E. Definitions.....	39

PART I—FUNDING OPPORTUNITY DESCRIPTION

A. Legislative Authority and Background

Section 7403 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-246) (FCEA) amended Section 3(d) of the Smith-Lever Act (7 U.S.C. 343(d)) to provide the opportunity for 1862 and 1890 land-grant institutions, including Tuskegee University and West Virginia State University, and the University of the District of Columbia to compete for and receive these funds. The Extension Integrated Pest Management Coordination and Support Program (EIPM – CS) is among the extension programs funded under this authority.

Background – Stakeholder Input

On March 26, 2009, the former Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service (CSREES) held a stakeholder listening session to gather comments for the second year of competitive 3(d) Extension IPM funding. FCEA Section 7403 amended the Smith-Lever Act in two ways: (1) the requirement for a competitive program delivery model as opposed to a long-standing formula delivery model; and (2) the inclusion of 1890 Institutions and the University of the District of Columbia as eligible entities to compete for and receive 3(d) funds. The primary intent of the listening session was to gather stakeholder input on program focus and design relative to FY 2009's competition. A *Federal Register* Notice (74 FR 12108) was published March 23, 2009, to notify stakeholders of the session and to solicit written comments. The notice requested input on the general administration of EIPM-CS including:

1. Solicitation of proposals,
2. Types of projects and awards length of awards,
3. Evaluation criteria,
4. Protocols to ensure the widest program participation,
5. Allocation of funds, including protocols to solicit and consider stakeholder input,
6. Determination of program priorities, and
7. Determination of activities to be supported.

A public comment period was open from March 23 to April 29, 2009, beginning with a listening session in Portland, Oregon, following the 6th International IPM Symposium. The session was attended by fifty stakeholders and university partners. The comments included both instructive suggestions to modify the FY 2010 RFA and impressions of the program being converted from a formula fund distribution model to a competitive model. The comments are summarized below, roughly in order of frequency. In some cases, related comments are grouped together.

Stakeholders commented most frequently that there is great value in having a network of IPM programs across states and that funding for coordination and infrastructure is critical to maintaining broad program function and utility. This comment was received thirty three times, representing thirty one separate stakeholder groups, from twenty one states and in all four regions. Twenty comments were received from twenty unique entities, representing sixteen states and all four geographic regions, stating that due to the great need for the program, stakeholders hope to see the Smith–Lever 3(d) funding line increased in coming years because there is greater

need than the current resources can support. To emphasize their belief in a broad based multi-state program, several stakeholders indicated support for a cap on funding per award (6 Comments/6 Entities/6 States/4 Regions). This strategy of capping individual awards was also supported in many other discussions in multi-state committee meetings, but without consensus on where that limit should be set. The FY 2011 RFA funding limits will remain the same as the FY 2010 level, with individual comprehensive *COORDINATION* awards set at \$350,000, down from \$650,000 in FY 2009. In addition, the funding cap for the *COORDINATION* function of the program was raised from \$25,000 in FY 2009 to \$30,000 in FY 2010 and FY 2011.

Stakeholders also made clear that base IPM program funding in the states is needed to leverage additional external funding. NIFA received twenty comments about leveraging base funds from twenty unique stakeholder groups, representing eleven states and three regions. While the EIPM-CS funds are perceived inadequate by stakeholder groups to support the full complement of most States' IPM programs, they help provide the basis for program development. Despite concern about the adequacy of base funding, a number of stakeholders expressed opposition to the re-allocation of Smith-Lever 3(d) funds historically used for extension and integrated components of the Regional Integrated Pest Management (RIPM) program to augment EIPM-CS (7 Comments/7 Entities/6 States/1 Region) (see <http://www.nifa.usda.gov/fo/regionalintegratedpestmgtnorthcentral.cfm>, <http://www.nifa.usda.gov/fo/regionalintegratedpestmgtnortheastern.cfm>, <http://www.nifa.usda.gov/fo/regionalintegratedpestmgtsouthern.cfm>, and <http://www.nifa.usda.gov/fo/regionalintegratedpestmgtsouthern.cfm> for more information on the RIPM funding opportunities). The converse opinion was stated as well, with no clear and immediate consensus opinion. No change to RIPM funding was implemented in FY 2011.

Overall, stakeholders and partners recognized the importance of stakeholder involvement in program development and implementation. As such, it is suggested that the program require enhanced stakeholder involvement and revised methods for peer review of proposals, giving additional consideration to the importance of stakeholder involvement (17 Comments/16 Entities/8 States/3 Regions). Furthermore, stakeholders acknowledged the value of collaboration. Stakeholders and partners support either a prioritization or requirement for collaboration between/among institutions (14 Comments/13 Entities/11 States/4 Regions). In response, fifteen points have been added to the evaluation criteria (see Part V. B.) to support proposals with excellent collaboration. These points should reflect more than routine collaboration.

Several stakeholders indicated that a revised methodology for determining distribution of funding, for all or parts of the program, would supply base functions across the land-grant university system (12 Comments/12 Entities/7 States/3 Regions). Specifically, stakeholders indicated that a level of funding of up to \$25,000 would be appropriate to maintain base functions (6 Comments/6 Entities/3 States/1 Region). Others indicated, in discussions at multi-state committee meetings, that the base level of support should be as high as \$75,000 per institution. The cap for base *COORDINATION* functions has been increased to a maximum of \$30,000 in FY 2010 and FY 2011, but the funds must remain competitive in accordance with the Smith-Lever Act as revised.

Continuity of IPM extension programs from one year to the next is a broad concern. Twenty-nine stakeholders from twenty-nine distinct groups indicated that the duration of the awards granted in the program need to be longer than one year. They also emphasized that continuation funding would support a more effective collaborative network of programs. These twenty-nine comments represented nineteen states and all four geographic regions. Continuation awards, up to two years in duration, are being offered in FY 2011. See Part II. B. for a complete definition of continuation awards.

Acknowledging that the program is complex, participants expressed concern that it is challenging for NIFA to assemble a panel of reviewers with sufficient knowledge across the breadth and depth of the program objectives and with extensive understanding of extension. As such, participants encouraged the agency to make an extra effort to enhance or improve review panel instruction, evaluation criteria, and/or panel composition. This comment was received twenty two times from twenty two unique entities from fifteen states and all four regions. Similarly, it was suggested that the history of previous funding and/or existing IPM infrastructure be provided to the panel and reflected in the review criteria (13 Comments/13 Entities/5 States/1 Region). The converse opinion was expressed by stakeholders in multi-state committee meetings. The agency continues to seek innovative ways to address these concerns for FY 2011. In an effort to address these concerns, specialized ad hoc review panel members will be recruited as needed to assess specific and unique program elements.

Partners indicated that the opportunity to host and award mini-grants/subawards in their states is an important part of the program implementation and they want to retain that flexibility (5 Comments/5 Entities/5 States/2 Regions). The agency continues to encourage awardees to develop their award plans before submission to reduce delays due to withheld funds pending completed documentation. Incomplete budgets or key personnel information caused delays in awards with associated mini-grants/subawards in FY 2010.

Several comments provided suggestions on ways to simplify the grants process without significantly altering the desired goal of accountability. Those recommendations to the program are as follows:

1. Restructure and simplify the budget portion of the RFA (9 Comments/9 distinct entities/8 States/3 Regions). In response, the budget narrative requirements were simplified and the separate funding area for collaboration was eliminated in the FY 2010 RFA. In FY2011, the expanded budget narrative is restored based on the recommendation of the panel; however, there will continue to be no separate funding category for collaboration. Collaboration is expected to be an element of multiple facets of a successful Extension IPM program.
2. Remove funding caps from areas of emphasis to allow greater flexibility in committing funds to the areas of greatest program need (17 Comments/17 Entities/11 States/4 Regions). In FY 2010 and FY 2011, primary program emphasis areas are not individually capped to simplify budgeting and allow for broader, more responsive and flexible goal setting.

3. Revise Project Narrative page limit standards to allow more complex programs to have more pages (7 Comments/6 Entities/6 States/3 Regions). The page limit was increased in the FY 2010 and maintained in the FY 2011 RFA, but there are limits imposed on individual sections.
4. Emphasize program flexibility. Oppose RFA becoming overly prescriptive (17 Comments/16 Entities/14 States/4 Regions). See 2. above.
5. Release RFA earlier or allow a longer open period (11 Comments/11 Entities/10 States/4 Regions). The FY 2010 RFA was open for about 60 days, slightly longer than FY 2009. The FY 2011 RFA will also be open for 50 days, which is also longer than 2009.

Some stakeholders and partners expressed concerns about multiple programs in an institution or state, and how that might hinder coordination. As such, they support a limit of one application being submitted per institution (5 Comments/4 Entities/4 States/2 Regions) and suggest that states with multiple programs be linked by designating a single IPM coordinating institution for the state (2 Comments/1 Entity/1 State/1 Region). The FY 2010 RFA limited the number of applications from each eligible institution to one and encouraged collaborations within and across state boundaries. The FY 2011 RFA allows one application from each eligible institution that did NOT receive a new continuation award in FY 2010. The RFA continues to encourage collaborations within and across state boundaries.

B. Purpose and Priorities

The primary elements of state extension IPM programs since inception have been to provide:

- A focal point for IPM team building, communication and stakeholder participation;
- Applied research and demonstration;
- Development of predictive models and information management systems;
- Preparation of manuals and fact sheets;
- Training programs for agents, consultants, scouts, growers, others; and
- Technical assistance and trouble shooting.

EIPM-CS funds help agricultural producers and other pest managers gain confidence in alternative pest management practices through training, demonstration, and evaluation of methods and strategies. These efforts will contribute to the achievement of national IPM goals. A strong NIFA/land-grant university partnership will enable EIPM – CS to address pest management challenges on an appropriate scale - from county level to multi-state production regions.

Each applicant will identify an IPM Coordinator(s) and propose program-level extension IPM activities appropriate to needs identified by stakeholder advisory committees and commodity teams operating at the state and local levels. Proposals will describe how the requested program funds will be used for a range of state-based extension activities that support national IPM goals. The EIPM – CS Program is intended to assure that IPM is a component of Cooperative Extension

programs at as many eligible institutions as possible. IPM has been promoted for many years, but there is an ongoing need to keep its varied and evolving practices in front of potential users to increase the likelihood of building sustainable pest management systems as stated in the National Road Map for IPM (www.nifa.usda.gov/nea/pest/in_focus/ipm_if_roadmap.html). The IPM road map was developed by several federal agencies in collaboration with partners in the public and private sectors to provide a strategic plan for federal investments in IPM programs. This document has served as the guide for IPM implementation since May 2004.

The IPM road map established the future direction for IPM within the context of:

1. Improving cost benefit analyses through the adoption of IPM practices.
2. Reducing potential human health risks from pests and related pest management practices.
3. Minimizing adverse environmental effects from pests and related pest management practices.

While the road map identified three focus areas for IPM implementation (production agriculture, natural resources and recreational environments, and residential and public areas), the authors acknowledged that IPM is useful and desirable in other situations. This RFA uses broader areas of programming emphasis within the basic structure provided in the road map. To simplify, the principles of IPM should assure that neither the pest nor the management practices for that pest detract from our quality of life. IPM is a multi-disciplinary approach that may encompass the management of vertebrate and arthropod pests, plant diseases, and weeds in all environments and in all pest related disciplines. All applicants to this program must recognize that this is a Cooperative Extension program and as such does not directly create knowledge through research, but disseminates knowledge to users beyond the traditional classroom and assesses program outcomes in a trans-disciplinary manner.

The EIPM-CS Program strongly encourages applicants to develop partnerships that include collaboration with: (1) small- or mid-sized, accredited colleges and universities; and/or (2) 1994 land-grant institutions, Hispanic-serving institutions, and/or other institutions that serve high-risk, under-served, or hard-to-reach audiences or international partnerships, linkages, and exchanges that contribute to solving alternative pest management practices through training, demonstration, and evaluation of methods and strategies in the United States.

C. Project Types

In the FY 2011 EIPM-CS RFA, NIFA announces two distinct components:

1. **COORDINATION** proposals should be focused on the creation/enhancement of a program of extension IPM activities that address multiple program emphasis areas described in section 1 of this subpart – (See also Table on page 20.)
2. **SUPPORT** proposals should address a specific need identified in section 1 of this subpart – (See also Table on page 21.)

PLEASE NOTE: IN FY 2011, AN APPLICANT INSTITUTION IS LIMITED TO SUBMITTING ONLY ONE *COORDINATION* AND ONLY ONE *SUPPORT* APPLICATION.

1. EIPM-CS *COORDINATION* PROGRAMS – Administer Basic Functions of Institutional Extension IPM Programs.

In FY 2011, NIFA anticipates making up to thirty *COORDINATION* awards of varying amounts to eligible institutions. *COORDINATION* awards will be for a project period of two years. Funding beyond the initial year may be provided through continuation awards, depending on the amount of funding provided by Congress, progress, and the best interest of the Federal government and the public. **Each qualifying application must be accompanied by a letter from the Extension Director/Extension Administrator authorizing the application as the official application of the institution or be submitted directly by the Extension Director/Extension Administrator. Submissions from an institution without endorsement by the Extension Director/Extension Administrator will result in the application being excluded from review. Multiple applications from a single institution for *COORDINATION* activities may result in all applications from that institution being excluded from review.**

COORDINATION applications must request funding for comprehensive extension IPM programs that address emphasis areas most suitable to the capacity and expertise of the applicant institution. Comprehensive proposals must describe a multi-disciplinary approach to extension IPM that begins with the designation of an Extension IPM coordinator(s) and include a description of the IPM coordinator's duties. These duties include, but are not limited to, the following activities:

- Planning and coordinating extension IPM outreach,
- Responding to IPM-related inquiries from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and other governmental and non-governmental organizations,
- Coordinating and reporting on state/institutional IPM activities across disciplinary boundaries,
- Supporting county-level activities in IPM and developing new stand-alone, supplemental and collaborative IPM efforts,
- Engaging in dialogue with stakeholders and responding appropriately to identified needs,
- Fulfilling program management and team building functions,
- Representing the institution through participation in regional or multi-state committees and other networking activities that strengthen cross-institutional collaboration,
- Defining transdisciplinary impacts of environmental and human health aspects of IPM activities, and
- Reporting to regional, national, or international meetings on program activities, progress, and outcomes.

Applicants can then develop their proposals by adding program emphasis areas most suited to the capacity of the institution to address identified stakeholder needs. Funding amounts requested should appropriately reflect the scope or scale of the activities proposed for each emphasis area addressed. All *COORDINATION* applications must describe the extent and ability of the proposing institution to conduct the extension IPM activities for each program emphasis area requested for funding.

IPM COORDINATION Program Development Awards (an alternative option for institutions in the early stages of IPM program development): As an alternative to proposing a full IPM Coordination program (i.e., IPM *COORDINATION* plus a minimum of one primary emphasis area), institutions with no history of an IPM program may opt to apply for a program planning grant. Planning grants will run for two years and provide institutions an opportunity to address program goals and strengths, placing them in a stronger position to launch a full IPM program. Each applicant may apply for up to \$30,000/year for this IPM COORDINATION function. **Please Note:** Awardees of IPM COORDINATION Program Development Grants will not be considered for successive awards in this category. Awardees in this category may apply for a full IPM COORDINATION program upon expiration of this two year award. If applicants have questions about appropriateness of activities, they are encouraged to contact the program director for assistance.

IPM COORDINATION Program Requirements (Basic requirements for all full IPM COORDINATION Applications): IPM coordination at each funded institution includes the foundational functions of IPM program coordination. Coordination responsibilities may be assigned to one person or may be distributed among two or more individuals. **The proposal must identify the individual(s) who will have administrative and programmatic responsibilities for the proposed extension IPM program in the Project Summary. The programmatic lead must be identified as an IPM coordinator for the institution.** The program director (PD) may be the IPM coordinator, but that individual is not required to assume that role. If selected for funding, the individuals designated in this section are jointly responsible for overall leadership of IPM extension programs at the institution to ensure that IPM efforts are coordinated with other relevant programs. *Each applicant may apply for up to \$30,000/year for this coordination function.* IPM COORDINATION Project periods are for a maximum 2 year project period.

All IPM COORDINATION proposals must describe the stakeholders who will be served, the type of program coordination and activities proposed, the economic and social impact of proposed activities, the level of collaboration and partnership with stakeholders, etc. Proposals should reflect the principles of IPM described in the National Roadmap for IPM (nifa.usda.gov/nea/pest/in_focus/ipm_if_roadmap.html) and offer appropriate solutions to pest issues through the delivery of education and coordination of programs directed to end users (e.g., producers, homeowners and IPM practitioners). All emphasis areas within a program **MUST** contain an evaluation function identifying changes in knowledge, behavior and condition or culture.

While not the only acceptable method to plan a program and assess outcomes, a logic model is suggested as a good option for planning and evaluation in both the *COORDINATION* and

SUPPORT programs (see www.nifa.usda.gov/about/strat_plan_logic_models.html for more information with some specific examples available at www.ipm.gov/LogicModels/index.cfm). Other implementation and evaluation plans are acceptable as long as they provide detail similar to a logic model, such as outputs and expected outcomes over the short, medium, and long term. The logic model/plan may be included as an attachment to the application, but a logic model or alternate plan is expected for each component of the application.

IPM Collaboration: EIPM-CS encourages collaboration among institutions with common program elements. Logical advantages may be realized by coordinating efforts with multiple institutional programs. This may result in synergy in program outcomes by crossing geographical or political boundaries within agroecosystems/ecozones or within areas where similar production practices or pest problems may prevail. IPM collaborations are desirable as a means of minimizing duplication of effort and providing continuity across geographic areas with common problems, production practices or pest management practices. These collaborations may cross state borders if common program elements exist and the collaboration contributes to the goals of EIPM-CS. A single application may detail multiple collaborations. While no funding is specifically tied to the facilitation of collaboration, applicants are encouraged to integrate collaborative programs in every emphasis area that provides advantage to one or all partners by leveraging personnel, expertise or other resources. (See Evaluation Criteria Part V.B.3.). **Collaboration is NOT a separate funding subcategory**, but should be reflected in program activities.

All parties applying to the program with proposed involvement in a specific collaboration should describe their role in the collaboration in detail as part of their EIPM-CS applications. If one applying collaborator does not describe a complementary program included in another institution's proposal, there is an appearance that the program is not truly collaborative. Clearly defined collaborations will receive credit in the proposal review process.

Emphasis Areas for IPM *COORDINATION* (added to the IPM *COORDINATION* Function) are divided as follows:

- a. Primary *COORDINATION* Program Emphasis Areas; and
- b. Secondary *COORDINATION* Program Emphasis Areas

A minimum of one primary emphasis area and a maximum of six emphasis areas (primary and/or secondary) are required in all *COORDINATION* applications, except for Program Development Grants.)

All EIPM – CS *COORDINATION* applications must include support for Extension IPM *COORDINATION* (as described in a. below) and address a minimum of one (must be a primary program area) and a maximum of six of the twelve (four primary, eight secondary) program emphasis areas listed below:

- a. Primary *COORDINATION* Program Emphasis Areas The list (1-4 below) is alphabetic by emphasis area and does not represent any EIPM-CS priority. These primary program emphasis areas carry equal value in the ranking of an application during the peer review

process. There is no funding cap or required percentages associated with these primary emphasis areas as long as the **total proposal** does not exceed \$350,000/year. The project period for awards made in FY 2011 will be for two years duration.

1. IPM Implementation for **Agronomic Crops**.
2. IPM Implementation for **Animal Agriculture**.
3. IPM Training for **Consumer/Urban Environments**.
4. IPM Implementation for **Specialty Crops**.

Description of Primary *COORDINATION* Program Emphasis Areas

1. **IPM Implementation for Agronomic Crops** – To include grain and oilseed crops such as wheat, corn, cotton, soybean, rice, cultivated forages, mixed rangeland forages and other crops traditionally viewed as agronomic. Justification must be provided for the size of the funding request based on the economic significance of the crop and the need for IPM in the crop as defined by statewide receipts, acres planted the potential for addressing environmental or health risks, stakeholder input and/or the importance of the pest in a local cropping system.
2. **IPM Implementation for Animal Agriculture** – Extension training, outreach programs and materials development to increase adoption of IPM practices in livestock production and other areas of animal agriculture. Justification must be provided for the size of the request based on reach, and significance of the industry and opportunities for adoption of IPM by the industry.
3. **IPM Training for Consumer/Urban Environments** – Extension training programs and materials development/delivery to increase adoption of IPM practices by private citizens in the home landscape, lawn care companies, garden centers, urban foresters and similar practitioners and applications. [**Note:** Programming for commercial nursery and greenhouse production should be included in emphasis area #4 “IPM Implementation for Specialty Crops” listed below. Home horticulture is represented in this program emphasis area.] Significant linkages with state and/or county Extension Master Gardener programs are strongly encouraged. Justification must be provided for the size of the funding request based on the local risk from the pests described in the proposal, the level of service provided to the public, and the economic significance of the pest to consumer horticulture.
4. **IPM Implementation for Specialty Crops** – Specialty crops are defined as fruits and vegetables, tree nuts, dried fruits, and horticulture and nursery crops (including floriculture) (www.nifa.usda.gov/funding/pdfs/definition_of_specialty_crops.pdf). Input costs, intensiveness of labor or production, or return on investment are typically greater for specialty crops than with typical grain or oilseed crops. Justification must be provided for the size of the funding request based on the economic significance of the crop and the need for IPM in the crop as defined by statewide receipts, planted acres, the potential for addressing environmental or health risks, stakeholder input and/or the importance of the pest in a local cropping system.

- b. Secondary *COORDINATION* Program Emphasis Areas The list (1-8 below) is alphabetic by emphasis area and does not represent any EIPM-CS priority. These secondary program emphasis areas carry equal value in the ranking of an application during the peer review process. Each individual area is capped at \$50,000 per year, for each of the two years of the application's duration.

1. IPM Coordination within **Conservation** Partnerships.
2. IPM Support for Pest **Diagnostic** Facilities.
3. IPM Training and Implementation in **Housing**.
4. IPM Education for **Pesticide** Applicators.
5. IPM in **Public** Health.
6. IPM on **Recreational** Lands.
7. IPM Training and Implementation in **Schools**.
8. IPM Partnerships in **Wide-Area** Pest Monitoring and Reporting Systems.

Description of Secondary *COORDINATION* Program Emphasis Areas

- 1. IPM Coordination within Conservation Partnerships** – Includes coordination with local NRCS districts or state conservationists to implement the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) 595 standard for pest management ([ftp://ftp-fc.sc.egov.usda.gov/NHQ/practice-standards/standards/595.pdf](http://ftp-fc.sc.egov.usda.gov/NHQ/practice-standards/standards/595.pdf)). The 595 standard for the pest management practice is applied as part of a conservation system to mitigate the negative impacts on soil, water air, plant, and animal and/or human resources and to protect and enhance quantity and quality of agricultural outputs. Applicants must show evidence of collaboration with their NRCS state conservationist or local conservation districts. Budget must reflect level of collaboration. Justification must be provided for the size of the request based on the significance of the issue and the potential of successful coordination with NRCS and local conservation districts.
- 2. IPM Support for Pest Diagnostics Facilities** – Proper pest diagnostics are fundamental to the application of appropriate pest management practices. The foundation of pest management is clear identification of the pest or problem. Stakeholder input provided to NIFA acknowledged the critical nature of IPM support for such diagnostic facilities. Justification must be provided for the size of the request based on the defined need and existing support for diagnostic facilities.
- 3. IPM Training and Implementation in Housing** – Includes extension training programs, and materials development and delivery, to increase adoption of IPM practices in housing to address resident exposure to pest-related allergens and pesticide residues. Justification must be provided for the size of the request based on the number of housing units to be served and the need for IPM in the facilities. Programs may target public and/or housing on tribal lands, or other forms of housing and collaborate with county social services and other entities that make housing affordable and accessible, such as Habitat for Humanity.

- 4. IPM Education for Pesticide Applicators** – IPM principles are an integral part of many pesticide applicator training activities. This training often takes place as part of topic-specific training for certification/recertification category credit. However, in most states, general IPM principles are also incorporated into core credit education delivered to all types of applicators. Justification must be provided for the size of the funding request based on the training outputs to be achieved and their corresponding outcomes. Priority will be given to educational activities with the highest likelihood of achieving positive and measurable impacts toward the goals articulated in the IPM road map. Strong linkages with the Pesticide Safety Education Program (PSEP) and other existing applicator education programs are expected to be incorporated in proposals submitted for this emphasis area. However, activities specifically providing IPM education for pesticide applicators must be developed under this emphasis area. Proposals that provide general support for related extension programs will not be considered for funding.
- 5. IPM in Public Health** – Extension training programs and materials development and delivery to increase adoption of IPM practices for management of ticks and lice, mosquitoes and similar pests of humans, particularly those that may vector disease. Justification must be provided for the size of the request based on the local risk from the described pests. Risks from pests of humans are highly regional. Evidence of incidence of disease or frequency of pest incidence in a locale are valid justifications for importance of a local pest problem. Partnerships may involve entities outside the university community such as city or county public health services, Federal service agencies and non-governmental entities. However, these non-land-grant IPM partners may not originate a proposal. [Indoor pests such as bedbugs should be addressed under secondary emphasis area 3, “IPM Training and Implementation in Housing”.]
- 6. IPM on Recreational Lands** – Extension training programs and materials development and delivery to increase adoption of IPM practices in parks, athletic facilities, golf courses, natural areas, parklands and other recreational areas. Partnerships should be cultivated with federal and state agencies that manage public lands.
- 7. IPM Training and Implementation in Schools** – Extension training, outreach programs and materials development to increase adoption of IPM practices in schools to address childhood exposure to pest related allergens and pesticide residues in the PreK-12 school environment. Additionally, activities may include development and/or delivery of extension IPM education programs. Justification must be provided for the size of the request based on the number of school districts to be served, need for IPM in the educational environment or demonstrated need for pest management in the district served.
- 8. IPM Partnerships in Wide-Area Pest Monitoring and Reporting Systems** – Participation in pest monitoring is encouraged when it is associated with wide-area tracking such as through the integrated pest management Pest Information Platform for Extension and Education (ipmPIPE). Tracking and monitoring efforts require

implementation of standardized national protocols for ipmPIPE. Preparation of training and extension education materials within those systems may be a component of this program area. The ipmPIPE provides a delivery model for the development of tools to increase usefulness, improve data retrieval and interpretation, and maintain databases and other information resources needed for pest management decision making. Detailed information about ipmPIPE can be found at www.ipmpipe.org/. Justification must be provided for the size of the request based on costs to conduct the proposed activities associated with the monitoring program and how the funds will complement funding from other sources.

2. *EIPM-CS SUPPORT PROJECTS – Address Critical Regional or National IPM Extension Program Needs*

In FY 2011, *SUPPORT* projects within EIPM – CS will advance the goals of the National Roadmap for IPM (nifa.usda.gov/nea/pest/in_focus/ipm_if_roadmap.html) by supporting projects to address the significant overarching issues of:

- a. Development of extension multi-state small farms IPM working groups; and
- b. Extension development for critical IPM issues.

These two efforts will support and strengthen the likelihood of national IPM goals being reached by enabling collaboration and enhancing the ability of the PDs to report mission critical impacts across institutional boundaries. No more than one *EIPM-CS SUPPORT* application will be accepted from each eligible institution. In FY 2011, NIFA anticipates making one small farms IPM working group award and up to three critical IPM issues awards.

SUPPORT proposals submitted under EIPM – CS should be relevant to program development for small farms on a national scale OR to extension development for critical IPM issues. Each qualifying application must be accompanied by a letter from the institution's Extension Director/Extension Administrator or be submitted directly by the Extension Director/Extension Administrator. Other submissions from an institution without endorsement by the Extension Director/Extension Administrator will be excluded from review. Multiple applications from a single institution for *SUPPORT* activities may result in all applications from that institution being excluded from review.

An individual institution may apply as the primary applicant to only one of the following two project types:

a. Development of Multi-State Small Farms IPM Working Groups: Extension IPM programs have not fully served the need of the small producers. Small farms can be generally defined as any farming operation with total receipts of less than \$250,000/year. Please review Small Farm classifications at www.extension.org/pages/USDA_Small_Farm_Definitions. This project type should link programs at multiple eligible institutions that address small farms and build strength in IPM disciplines through collaborative efforts to reach this new and growing audience.

All applications must include a budget and budget narrative for each year of the proposed project in the application. **Applications may request up to a total of \$150,000 for project periods up to two years in duration.**

b. Development of Extension Education Programs for Critical IPM Issues: High consequence and threatening pests and diseases are posing an increasing risk to American agriculture. The following issues are recognized relevant emerging issues that are eligible for funding in FY 2011:

1. Emergent citrus pests and diseases.
2. Brown marmorated stink bug.
3. Other new or resurgent arthropod pests or pathogens. Applicants must explain why that pest should be considered for funding under this program.
4. The development of “push” technologies and applications for handheld devices to reach clientele with pest decision support information in a real-time framework. These new tools should have application beyond the borders of the state of the lead institution submitting the application. There should be multi-state involvement and endorsement.
5. New Educational materials/demonstrations for wide area IPM projects addressing high consequence pests across multi-state areas. Linkages to identified needs from such programs as NPDRS and Pest Management Strategic Plans (PMSP) (www.ipmcenters.org/pmsp/index.cfm), or auxiliary programs such as National Plant Diagnostic Network (NPDN) (npdn.org) , Protect U.S. (protectingUSnow.com), or other such programs is encouraged. **Please Note:** materials or demonstrations proposed to meet this objective should be designed to be geared for traditional extension work (e.g., Pest Alert flyers/media, conferences, and outreach or demonstration projects, including 21st century delivery mechanisms for traditional extension) as opposed to providing funds to supplement previously existing program/system materials.

Projects should develop extension education products/materials and/or demonstration and applied research targeted at an extension audience. Extension IPM applications on critical issues should help prepare producers for the arrival of pests of high consequence or management of these pests after have they become established. **Applications may request up to a total of \$50,000 for project periods one year in duration.**

PART II—AWARD INFORMATION

A. Available Funding

There is no commitment by USDA to fund any particular application or to make a specific number of awards. NIFA anticipates approximately \$1.3 million to fund applications in FY 2011. Of that, it is anticipated that approximately \$1 million will be awarded for EIPM-CS *COORDINATION* programs and up to \$300,000 will be awarded for EIPM-CS *SUPPORT* projects. The statutory limit of program funding is five years; however, see Part II., C., below for specific project periods.

Please note: This RFA is being released prior to the passage of an Appropriations Act for FY 2011. Enactment of additional Continuing Resolutions or an Appropriations Act may affect the availability or level of funding for this program.

Awards issued as a result of this RFA will have designated the Automated Standard Applications for Payment System (ASAP), operated by the Department of Treasury's Financial Management Service, as the payment system for funds. For more information see http://www.nifa.usda.gov/business/method_of_payment.html.

B. Types of Applications

In FY 2011, only new applications may be submitted to EIPM-CS. This is a project application that has not been previously submitted to the **EIPM-CS** Program. New applications will be reviewed competitively using the selection process and evaluation criteria described in Part V—Application Review Requirements.

EIPM *COORDINATION* awards may be made as continuation grants. NIFA is under no obligation to award a continuation grant and should NIFA decide to make such an award, the Authorized Departmental Officer (ADO) must make an affirmative decision to do so. A continuation grant is an instrument by which NIFA agrees to support a specified level of effort for a predetermined project period with a statement of intention to provide additional support at a future date, provided that performance has been satisfactory, funds are available for this purpose, and continued support would be in the best interest of the Federal government and the public.

EIPM *SUPPORT* Awards will be made as standard grants which are instruments by which NIFA agrees to support a specified level of effort for a predetermined project period without any statement of intention to provide additional support at a future date.

C. Program Components

1. EIPM – CS *COORDINATION* program funding –

- It is anticipated that up to thirty programs may be funded for a maximum of \$350,000 per award/per year. The project period for awards made in FY 2011 will be for two years in duration.

2. **EIPM – CS *SUPPORT*** program funding –

- **Development of Multi-State Small Farms IPM Working Groups** – It is anticipated that one project will be awarded funding. For FY 2011, applications may request up to a total of \$150,000 for a project period of up to two years in duration. No projects may be funded if no acceptable applications are submitted.
- **Extension Development for Critical IPM Issues** – It is anticipated that a maximum of three projects will be funded. For FY 2011, applications may request up to a total of \$50,000 for project periods of up to one year in duration. Fewer than three proposals may be funded if there are not three acceptable applications submitted.

EIPM – CS Funding Table

EIPM-CS COORDINATION Program

Each eligible institution may submit only one *IPM COORDINATION* Program proposal. With the exception of *IPM COORDINATION* Program Development Awards, proposals must include support for *IPM COORDINATION* and a minimum of **one primary** and a maximum of **six total** emphasis areas.

The project period for *IPM COORDINATION* awards made in FY 2011 will **EXCLUSIVELY** be made for two years in duration.

	Components and Emphasis Areas	Funding Cap/year
<i>Alternative option for Institutions in the early stages of IPM Program Development**</i>	<i>IPM COORDINATION Program Development Awards</i>	\$ 30,000
Required Component	IPM COORDINATION Function	\$ 30,000
Primary Program Emphasis Area	IPM Implementation in Agronomic Crops	No limit*
Primary Program Emphasis Area	IPM Implementation for Animal Agriculture	No limit*
Primary Program Emphasis Area	IPM Training for Consumer / Urban Environments	No limit*
Primary Program Emphasis Area	IPM Implementation in Specialty Crops	No limit*
Secondary Emphasis Area	IPM Coordination within Conservation Partnerships	\$ 50,000
Secondary Emphasis Area	IPM Support for Pest Diagnostic Facilities	\$ 50,000
Secondary Emphasis Area	IPM Training and Implementation in Housing	\$ 50,000
Secondary Emphasis Area	IPM Education for Pesticide Applicators	\$ 50,000
Secondary Emphasis Area	IPM in Public Health	\$ 50,000
Secondary Emphasis Area	IPM on Recreational Lands	\$ 50,000
Secondary Emphasis Area	IPM Training and Implementation in Schools	\$ 50,000
Secondary Emphasis Area	IPM Partnerships in Wide-Area Pest Monitoring and Reporting Systems	\$ 50,000

****However, the total budget of the proposal cannot exceed \$350,000/year, including IPM COORDINATION, primary emphasis areas, and secondary emphasis areas.***

**** Please Note:** Awardees of IPM COORDINATION Program Development Grants will not be considered for successive awards in this category. Awardees in this category may apply for a full IPM COORDINATION program in future years.

EIPM-CS *SUPPORT* Program

Each institution may submit only one proposal for a *SUPPORT* project.

	*Available Funds/Project Cap
Development of Multi-State Small Farms IPM Working Groups. Project period is up to 2 years	\$ up to 150,000 total / \$150,000 each
Extension Development for Critical IPM Issues. Project period is 1 year	\$ up to 150,000 total / \$50,000 each

* For FY 2011

PART III—ELIGIBILITY INFORMATION

A. Eligible Applicants

Only 1862 and 1890 land-grant universities and colleges, including Tuskegee University and West Virginia State University, and the University of the District of Columbia that did NOT receive a new continuation award in FY 2010 are eligible to apply for IPM COORDINATION grants. All 1862 and 1890 land-grant universities and colleges, including Tuskegee University and West Virginia State University, and the University of the District of Columbia FY 2011 are eligible to apply for IPM SUPPORT grants.

Award recipients may subcontract to organizations not eligible to apply provided such organizations are necessary for the conduct of the project. An applicant's failure to meet an eligibility criterion by the time of an application deadline may result in the application being excluded from consideration or, even though an application may be reviewed, will preclude NIFA from making an award.

B. Cost Sharing or Matching

There is no matching requirement for EIPM – CS applications and matching resources will not be factored into the review process as evaluation criteria.

PART IV—APPLICATION AND SUBMISSION INFORMATION

A. Electronic Application Package

Only electronic applications may be submitted via Grants.gov to NIFA in response to this RFA. **Applicants are advised to submit early to the Grants.gov system.**

New Users of Grants.gov

Prior to preparing an application, it is suggested that the PD/PI first contact an Authorized Representative (AR) (also referred to as Authorized Organizational Representative or AOR) to determine if the organization is prepared to submit electronic applications through Grants.gov. If the organization is not prepared (e.g., the institution/organization is new to the electronic grant application process through Grants.gov), then the one-time registration process must be completed PRIOR to submitting an application. It can take as much as two weeks to complete the registration process so it is critical to begin as soon as possible. In such situations the AR should go to **“Get Registered” on the Grants.gov left navigation bar (or go to http://www.grants.gov/applicants/get_registered.jsp) for information on registering the institution/organization with Grants.gov. A quick reference guide listing the steps is available as a 4-page PDF document at the following website: <http://www.grants.gov/section910/Grants.govRegistrationBrochure.pdf>.**

Steps to Obtain Application Package Materials

The steps to access application materials are as follows:

1. In order to access, complete and submit applications, applicants must download and install a version of Adobe Reader compatible with Grants.gov. This software is essential to apply for NIFA Federal assistance awards. For basic system requirements and download instructions, please see http://www.grants.gov/help/download_software.jsp. To verify that you have a compatible version of Adobe Reader, Grants.gov established a test package that will assist you in making that determination. Grants.gov Adobe Versioning Test Package: <http://www.grants.gov/applicants/AdobeVersioningTestOnly.jsp>.
2. The application package must be obtained via Grants.gov, go to <http://www.grants.gov>, click on “Apply for Grants” in the left-hand column, click on **“Step 1: Download a Grant Application Package and Instructions,”** enter the funding opportunity number **USDA-NIFA-SLBCD-003411** in the appropriate box and click “Download Package.” From the search results, click “Download” to access the application package.

Contained within the application package is the “NIFA Grants.gov Application Guide: A Guide for Preparation and Submission of NIFA Applications via Grants.gov.” This Guide contains an introduction and general Grants.gov instructions, information about how to use a Grant Application Package in Grants.gov, and instructions on how to complete the application forms.

If assistance is needed to access the application package (e.g., downloading or navigating Adobe forms), **or submitting the application** then refer to resources available on the Grants.gov Web site first (<http://www.grants.gov/>). Grants.gov assistance is also available as follows:

Grants.gov customer support

Toll Free: 1-800-518-4726

Business Hours: 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. Closed on [Federal Holidays](#).

Email: support@grants.gov

See <http://www.nifa.usda.gov/funding/electronic.html> for additional resources for applying electronically.

B. Content and Form of Application Submission

Electronic applications should be prepared following Part V and VI of the document entitled “A Guide for Preparation and Submission of NIFA Applications via Grants.gov.” This guide is part of the corresponding application package (see Section A. of this Part). The following is **additional information** needed in order to prepare an application in response to this RFA. **If there is discrepancy between the two documents, the information contained in this RFA is overriding.**

Note the attachment requirements (e.g., portable document format) in Part III section 3. of the Guide. **ANY PROPOSALS CONTAINING NON-PDF DOCUMENTS WILL BE AT RISK OF BEING EXCLUDED FROM NIFA REVIEW.** Partial applications will be excluded from NIFA review. With documented prior approval, resubmitted applications will be accepted until close of business on the closing date in the RFA.

If you do not own PDF-generating software, Grants.gov provides online tools to assist applicants. Users will find a link to “Convert Documents to PDF” on <http://grants.gov/assets/PDFConversion.pdf>.

For any questions related to the preparation of an application please review the NIFA Grants.gov Application Guide and the applicable request for applications. If assistance is still needed for preparing application forms content, contact:

- Email: electronic@nifa.usda.gov
- Phone: 202-401-5048
- Business hours: Monday through Friday, 7:00 am – 5:00 pm Eastern Time, excluding Federal holidays.

1. SF 424 R&R Cover Sheet

Information related to the questions on this form is dealt with in detail in Part V, 2. of the NIFA Grants.gov Application Guide.

2. SF 424 R&R Project/Performance Site Location(s)

Information related to the questions on this form is dealt with in detail in Part V, 3. of the NIFA Grants.gov Application Guide.

3. R&R Other Project Information Form

Information related to the questions on this form is dealt with in detail in Part V, 4. of the NIFA Grants.gov Application Guide.

a. Field 7 - Project Summary/Abstract. The Project Summary may not exceed **250 words** on one page, and should clearly indicate the appropriate EIPM-CS program (*COORDINATION* or *SUPPORT*). For EIPM-CS *COORDINATION* proposals, identify the program and administrative lead(s) and list the *emphasis areas* and collaborations with eligible entities included in the proposal. For EIPM-CS *SUPPORT* proposals, include the project type proposed. The summary should also include the program emphasis areas proposed, program goals, and relevance of the project to the goals of EIPM-CS. The importance of a concise, informative Project Summary cannot be overemphasized. Please find the suggested Project Summary/Abstract Template at: www.nifa.usda.gov/funding/templates/project_summary.doc.

b. Field 8 - Project Narrative. PLEASE NOTE: the Project Narrative section may not exceed a total of 25 single- or double-spaced pages, including figures and tables. The Introduction may not exceed 5 pages, and the rest of the Project Narrative may not exceed 20 pages total; no single emphasis area narrative may exceed 5 pages. These EIPM-CS page limitations apply regardless of whether figures or tables are included. All pages, including those with figures and tables, should be numbered sequentially. Applications exceeding the applicable page limitation will be at risk of being excluded from review. These maximums have been established to ensure fair and equitable competition. However, if logic models are prepared to illustrate the program, the models can be attached as an Appendix in Field 12 (see **c.** below) and will not count against the narrative page total.

The Project Narrative must include all of the following:

(i) Introduction.

Include the following:

1. List of Program Staff – include name, title, affiliation, address, and e-mail for PD(s), CoPD(s) and Key Personnel (*defined as all individuals who contribute in a substantive, measurable way to the scientific development or execution of the project whether or not salaries are requested*). For *COORDINATION* applications: the IPM Coordinator(s) and administrative contact(s) must be identified.
2. A clear statement of the goal(s) and critical need(s) of IPM being addressed and supporting extension outreach objectives.
3. Description of how stakeholders will be engaged in setting extension IPM program direction on an on-going basis.
4. Summary of the body of knowledge or other past activities that substantiate the need for the proposed project/program.

5. Description of ongoing or recently completed significant activities related to the proposed project/program including the work of key project/program personnel. Applications should also demonstrate how duplication of effort with similar activities by others will be avoided.
6. Preliminary data/information pertinent to the proposed work should be included in this section. All works cited should be referenced and attached at Field 9 of this Form, Bibliography & Reference Cited. Refer to Part V, 4.9 of the NIFA Grants.gov Application Guide.

(ii) **Rationale and Significance.** Concisely present the rationale behind the proposed extension activities. The specific relationship of the project/program's objectives to one or more of the EIPM – CS emphasis areas should be shown clearly. These emphasis areas are described under Part I., C., Project Types.

(iii) **Approach.** For each component of requested funding in the IPM *COORDINATION* proposal (e.g., IPM *COORDINATION* and any of the program emphasis areas) clearly state the activities proposed or problems being addressed and clearly describe the approaches being applied. *SUPPORT* program proposals should also provide sufficient detail to describe proposed activities. Specifically, this section must include:

1. A description of the activities proposed, key personnel or institution roles in those activities, and the sequence in which the activities are to be performed;
2. Outputs and expected deliverables to be developed for the program;
3. Expected outcomes, including how the project/program expects to address overarching goals of the National Road Map for IPM: profitability, reducing potential human health risks from pests and related pest management practices, and minimizing adverse environmental impact;
4. How results or products will be used;
5. Means by which results will be assessed or evaluated; and
6. Pitfalls that may be encountered.

c. Field 12 - Other Attachments – PDF

Appendices to Project Description Appendices to the Project Description are allowed if they are directly germane to the proposed project/program. The addition of appendices should not be used to circumvent the text and/or figures and tables page limitations. For IPM *COORDINATION* program proposals please include a PDF attachment listing collaborations with eligible institutions, supporting documentation and a description of the roles to be performed by each institution. If IPM collaborations are described in this program, letters of collaboration **must** be attached in Field 12 as PDF attachments as part of the application from all applicants participating in the collaboration.

Letter of Support from Extension Director/Extension Administrator If the Extension Director/Extension Administrator did not submit the application, attach their letter of support in Field 12 as a PDF. Name the document “Extension Letter of Support”.

4. R&R Senior/Key Person Profile (Expanded)

Information related to the questions on this form is dealt with in detail in Part V, 5. of the NIFA Grants.gov Application Guide.

5. R&R Personal Data – As noted in Part V, 6. of the NIFA Grants.gov Application Guide, the submission of this information is voluntary and is not a precondition of award.

6. R&R Budget

Information related to the questions on this form is dealt with in detail in Part V, 7. of the NIFA Grants.gov Application Guide. Reasonable travel costs to report outcomes at regional, national or international meetings are allowable in the budget. COORDINATION applications must include a budget and budget narrative for each of the two years, as well as a cumulative budget. In addition, COORDINATION applications must include a breakdown that indicates costs by category for each program emphasis area.

If SUPPORT application funding is being requested for multiple years, include a budget and narrative for each year, as well as a cumulative budget

7. Supplemental Information Form

Information related to the questions on this form is dealt with in detail in Part VI, 1. of the NIFA Grants.gov Application Guide.

a. Field 2. Program Code Enter the program code name “Extension Integrated Pest Management – Coordination and Support Program” and the program code “**QQIPM**” for applications submitted for *COORDINATION* funding or “**QQ.E**” for applications submitted for *SUPPORT* funding.

b. Field 8. Conflict of Interest List Conflict of interest information is required for each senior / key person included in the Senior/Key Person Profile. Please find the suggested Conflict of Interest Template at: www.nifa.usda.gov/funding/templates/conflict_of_interest.doc.

C. Submission Dates and Times

Instructions for submitting an application are included in Part IV, Section 1.9 of the NIFA Grants.gov Application Guide.

Applications must be received by Grants.gov by COB on **March 29, 2011** (5:00 p.m. Eastern Time). Applications received after this deadline will normally not be considered for funding.

Applicants who have problems with the submission of an application to Grants.gov are encouraged to FIRST contact the Grants.gov Help Desk to resolve any problems. Keep a record of any such correspondence. See Part IV. A. for Grants.gov contact information.

Correspondence regarding submitted applications will be sent using e-mail. Therefore, applicants are strongly encouraged to provide accurate e-mail addresses, where designated, on the SF-424 R&R Application for Federal Assistance.

If the AR has not received correspondence **from NIFA** regarding a submitted application within 30 days of the established deadline, please contact the Program Contact identified in Part VII of the applicable RFA (for the Small Business Innovation Research program (SBIR) the Program Contacts are specified under subsection 1.5 of the SBIR Program Solicitation) and request the proposal number assigned to the application. **Failure to do so may result in (for competitive programs) the application not being considered for funding by the peer review panel or (for non-competitive programs) a delay in the issuance of an award. Once the application has been assigned a proposal number, this number should be cited on all future correspondence.**

D. Funding Restrictions

Pursuant to Section 1473 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (91 Stat. 981), indirect costs are unallowable costs under this program, and no funds will be approved for this purpose. Costs that are a part of an institution's indirect cost pool may not be reclassified as direct costs for the purpose of making them allowable.

In addition, tuition remission is prohibited by Section 1473 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977, as amended (7 U.S.C. 3319).

NIFA has determined that grant funds awarded under this authority may not be used for the renovation or refurbishment of research, education, or extension space; the purchase or installation of fixed equipment in such space; or the planning, repair, rehabilitation, acquisition, or construction of buildings or facilities.

E. Other Submission Requirements

The applicant should follow the submission requirements noted in the document entitled "A Guide for Preparation and Submission of NIFA Applications via Grants.gov."

Described below are the requirements for successful submission of an application, all of the following steps must be met for an application to be considered for peer review:

- 1) Meeting the deadline: To electronically send the application to Grants.gov the submit button is hit, which triggers a date and time stamp on the application. The date and time stamp is used to determine whether the application was received by Grants.gov before the deadline, which is prior to close of business (5:00 p.m. Eastern Time) on **March 29, 2011**. An application submitted or resubmitted after the deadline is late. Consideration of late applications is only given in extenuating circumstances (e.g., natural disasters, confirmed Grants.gov outage) with proper documentation and support of the Agency Contact (see Part VII). The occurrence of one of these situations does not automatically ensure that a late application will be accepted. If an applicant wants a late application considered under an extenuating circumstance, the applicant should contact the Agency Contact accordingly.
- 2) Successful Grants.gov validation: The Grants.gov system performs a limited check of the application, and applicants are notified by Grants.gov of the outcome of the initial review. Applications meeting Grants.gov requirements are made available to the funding agency for further processing. Applications that fail Grants.gov validation may be resubmitted to Grants.gov if the original agency deadline has not passed. (Note that the Grants.gov system may allow applications to be submitted after the deadline has passed, but the application is considered late by NIFA.)
- 3) Successful Agency validation: NIFA staff perform precursory review of the application. The agency validation process includes, for example, meeting eligibility requirements and following agency application guidelines (e.g., formatting, page limitations, limits on budget requests). Applicants are notified by NIFA of the outcome of this review.

PART V—APPLICATION REVIEW REQUIREMENTS

A. General

Each application will be evaluated in a 2-part process. First, each application will be screened to ensure that it meets the administrative requirements as set forth in this RFA. Second, applications that meet these requirements will be technically evaluated by a review panel.

Reviewers will be selected based upon training and experience in relevant scientific, extension, or education fields, taking into account the following factors: (a) The level of relevant formal scientific, technical education, or extension experience of the individual, as well as the extent to which an individual is engaged in relevant research, education, or extension activities; (b) the need to include as reviewers experts from various areas of specialization within relevant scientific, education, or extension fields; (c) the need to include as reviewers other experts (e.g., producers, range or forest managers/operators, and consumers) who can assess relevance of the applications to targeted audiences and to program needs; (d) the need to include as reviewers experts from a variety of organizational types (e.g., colleges, universities, industry, state and Federal agencies, private profit and non-profit organizations) and geographic locations; (e) the need to maintain a balanced composition of reviewers with regard to minority and female representation and an equitable age distribution; and (f) the need to include reviewers who can judge the effective usefulness to producers and the general public of each application.

B. Evaluation Criteria

The evaluation criteria below will be used by the Peer Review panel in reviewing applications submitted in response to this RFA:

Criteria for EIPM – CS: *COORDINATION* Program Proposals

1. Proposal Relevance and Demonstration of Need (50 points):

- (a) Documented need. Application includes documentation substantiating that the program is directed to current or likely future problems/challenges in IPM regardless of discipline. Programs should address multidisciplinary needs in IPM. The application addresses national, regional or locally relevant IPM issues and desired outcomes described in the RFA (10 points);
- (b) Clearly defined plans to involve stakeholders. Application includes information on how stakeholders will be involved in defining the program and how their input will be solicited and incorporated or how stakeholder input was used to determine program goals. (10 points);
- (c) Quality of extension outreach plan. Application describes a detailed outreach plan that includes implements the principles of the National Roadmap for IPM, anticipated program benefits and how impacts will be measured, including the likelihood that the program will provide solutions that lead to measurable benefits to

producers and consumers, augmenting and supporting extension field staff activities in IPM (10 points);

- (d) Demonstrated understanding of IPM in emphasis areas addressed, building effective teams involving appropriate cooperators and disciplines, and networking with other regional programs (10 points); and
- (e) Documented trans-disciplinary approach that addresses economic, environmental and human health aspects of IPM. Proposal addresses appropriateness to all applicable pest groups and disciplines (10 points).

2. Proposal Quality (50 points):

- (a) Conceptual adequacy. Objectives are potentially attainable within program time, scope and budget (10 points);
- (b) Design. Methodology and analytical approach are appropriate to program objectives and plans for how and where the information will be reported to clientele and colleagues (10 points);
- (c) Involvement of appropriate, relevant expertise, including quality of collaborations. (10 points);
- (d) Experience of senior/key project/program personnel (5 points);
- (e) Appropriateness of budget (5 points);
- (f) Feasibility, probability of success (including the likelihood that the program will contribute to the overall sustainability of an IPM system), and ability to meet timelines defined in the RFA (10 points).

3. Collaboration (15 points). Collaboration that is apparent and closely links programs and builds teams across multiple institutions will be rewarded (15 points). There is no automatic assumption of collaboration. The application must highlight the leveraging of funds or resources across institutions, associations, or organizations if a part of the collaboration.

Determining Awards for the Highest Ranking COORDINATION Proposals:

Stakeholder input suggested that the EIPM-CS program fund as many programs as possible in order to ensure the success of a national IPM network. The peer review panel will evaluate the quality of program emphasis areas as a package/program relative to the proposed plan of EIPM-CS activities.

For the proposals ranked high enough to be considered for funding, the panel will evaluate the following:

- a. Integration of programming.
- b. Involvement of institutions in program delivery.
- c. Collaborative programming.
- d. Strength of program components (strong, average, weak) for each program.

Where certain proposal components are considered to be weak by the panel, applicants will be asked to submit revised budgets where these components have been removed from the funded project. Budgets may be adjusted based on the panel scores and comments.

Criteria for EIPM – CS: *SUPPORT* Program proposals

1. Proposal Relevance and Demonstration of Need (50 points):

- (a) Documented need. Application includes documentation substantiating that the project/program is directed to current or likely future problems/challenges in IPM. The proposal should address relevant IPM issues and desired outcomes described in the RFA (5 points).
- (b) Clearly demonstrates the institution's ability to fulfill the proposed activities (5 points);
- (c) Stakeholder involvement. Application includes information on how stakeholders will be involved in the project/program and how their input will be solicited and incorporated (10 points);
- (d) Extension outreach plan. Application includes a detailed outreach plan that includes project benefits and a description of how impacts will be measured, including the likelihood that the project/program will provide solutions that lead to measurable benefits to producers and consumers, and will facilitate information dissemination. Value of plan to evaluate how well the information technology need is being met (10 points);
- (e) Demonstrated understanding of small farms IPM issues or emerging pest systems (per objective being addressed) within the greater IPM system concept (10 points); and
- (f) Documented trans-disciplinary approach that addresses economic, environmental and human health aspects of IPM. Proposal addresses appropriateness to all applicable pest groups and disciplines (10 points).

2. Proposal Quality (50 points):

- (a) Conceptual adequacy. Objectives are potentially attainable within project/program time, scope and budget (10 points);

- (b) Design. Methodology and analytical approach are appropriate to project/program objectives (15 points);
- (c) Involvement of appropriate, relevant expertise (5 points);
- (d) Experience of senior/key project personnel (5 points);
- (e) Appropriateness of budget (5 points);
- (f) Feasibility, probability of success (including the likelihood that the project/program will contribute to the overall sustainability of an IPM system), and ability to meet timelines defined in the RFA (5 points); and
- (g) Adherence to RFA guidelines (5 points).

C. Conflicts of Interest and Confidentiality

During the peer evaluation process, extreme care will be taken to prevent any actual or perceived conflicts of interest that may impact review or evaluation. For the purpose of determining conflicts of interest, the academic and administrative autonomy of an institution shall be determined by reference to the current Higher Education Directory, published by Higher Education Publications, Inc., 6400 Arlington Boulevard, Suite 648, Falls Church, Virginia 22042. Phone: (703) 532-2300. Web site: <http://www.hepinc.com>.

Names of submitting institutions and individuals, as well as application content and peer evaluations, will be kept confidential, except to those involved in the review process, to the extent permitted by law. In addition, the identities of peer reviewers will remain confidential throughout the entire review process. Therefore, the names of the reviewers will not be released to applicants.

D. Organizational Management Information

Specific management information relating to an applicant shall be submitted on a one time basis, with updates on an as needed basis, as part of the responsibility determination prior to the award of a grant identified under this RFA, if such information has not been provided previously under this or another NIFA program. NIFA will provide copies of forms recommended for use in fulfilling these requirements as part of the preaward process. Although an applicant may be eligible based on its status as one of these entities, there are factors which may exclude an applicant from receiving Federal financial and nonfinancial assistance and benefits under this program (e.g., debarment or suspension of an individual involved or a determination that an applicant is not responsible based on submitted organizational management information).

PART VI—AWARD ADMINISTRATION

A. General

Within the limit of funds available for such purpose, the awarding official of NIFA shall make grants to those responsible, eligible applicants whose applications are judged most meritorious under the procedures set forth in this RFA. The date specified by the awarding official of NIFA as the effective date of the grant shall be no later than September 30 of the Federal fiscal year in which the project is approved for support and funds are appropriated for such purpose, unless otherwise permitted by law. It should be noted that the project need not be initiated on the grant effective date, but as soon thereafter as practical so that project goals may be attained within the funded project period. All funds granted by NIFA under this RFA shall be expended solely for the purpose for which the funds are granted in accordance with the approved application and budget, the regulations, the terms and conditions of the award, the applicable Federal cost principles, and the Department's assistance regulations (parts 3015 and 3019 of 7 CFR).

B. Award Notice

The award document will provide pertinent instructions and information including, at a minimum, the following:

- (1) Legal name and address of performing organization or institution to whom the Director has issued an award under the terms of this request for applications;
- (2) Title of project;
- (3) Name(s) and institution(s) of PD's chosen to direct and control approved activities;
- (4) Identifying award number assigned by the Department;
- (5) Project period, specifying the amount of time the Department intends to support the project without requiring recompetition for funds;
- (6) Total amount of Departmental financial assistance approved by the Director during the project period;
- (7) Legal authority(ies) under which the award is issued;
- (8) Appropriate Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) number;
- (9) Applicable award terms and conditions (see <http://www.nifa.usda.gov/business/awards/awardterms.html> to view NIFA award terms and conditions);
- (10) Approved budget plan for categorizing allocable project funds to accomplish the stated purpose of the award; and

(11) Other information or provisions deemed necessary by NIFA to carry out its respective awarding activities or to accomplish the purpose of a particular award.

C. Administrative and National Policy Requirements

Several Federal statutes and regulations apply to grant applications considered for review and to project grants awarded under this program. These include, but are not limited to:

7 CFR Part 1, subpart A—USDA implementation of the Freedom of Information Act.

7 CFR Part 3—USDA implementation of OMB Circular No. A-129 regarding debt collection.

7 CFR Part 15, subpart A—USDA implementation of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended.

7 CFR Part 331 and 9 CFR Part 121—USDA implementation of the Agricultural Bioterrorism Protection Act of 2002.

7 CFR Part 3015—USDA Uniform Federal Assistance Regulations, implementing OMB directives (i.e., OMB Circular Nos. A-21 and A-122 (2 CFR Parts 220 and 230), and incorporating provisions of 31 U.S.C. 6301-6308 (formerly the Federal Grant and Cooperative Agreement Act of 1977, Pub. L. No. 95-224), as well as general policy requirements applicable to recipients of Departmental financial assistance.

7 CFR Part 3017—USDA implementation of Governmentwide Debarment and Suspension (Nonprocurement).

7 CFR Part 3018—USDA implementation of Restrictions on Lobbying. Imposes prohibitions and requirements for disclosure and certification related to lobbying on recipients of Federal contracts, grants, cooperative agreements, and loans.

7 CFR Part 3019—USDA implementation of OMB Circular A-110, Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Other Agreements With Institutions of Higher Education, Hospitals, and Other Nonprofit Organizations (2 CFR Part 215).

7 CFR Part 3021—Governmentwide Requirements for Drug-Free Workplace (Financial Assistance).

7 CFR Part 3052—USDA implementation of OMB Circular No. A-133, Audits of States, Local Governments, and Nonprofit Organizations.

7 CFR Part 3407—CSREES procedures to implement the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended.

7 CFR 3430—Competitive and Noncompetitive Non-formula Grant Programs--General Grant Administrative Provisions.

29 U.S.C. 794 (section 504, Rehabilitation Act of 1973) and 7 CFR Part 15b (USDA implementation of statute) —prohibiting discrimination based upon physical or mental handicap in Federally assisted programs.

35 U.S.C. 200 et seq. —Bayh Dole Act, controlling allocation of rights to inventions made by employees of small business firms and domestic nonprofit organizations, including universities, in Federally assisted programs (implementing regulations are contained in 37 CFR Part 401).

D. Expected Program Outputs and Reporting Requirements

The Project Director will be expected to participate in a Project Directors reporting workshop once during the duration of any multi-year award period. That meeting may be held in Washington, DC or some other location where PDs from several related grant programs may report together.

PART VII—AGENCY CONTACT

Applicants and other interested parties are encouraged to contact Dr. Martin Draper; National Program Leader for Plant Pathology; Institute of Food Production and Sustainability; National Institute of Food and Agriculture; U.S. Department of Agriculture; STOP 2240; 1400 Independence Avenue, SW; Washington, DC 20250-2220; telephone: (202) 401-1990; fax: (202) 401-4888; e-mail: mdraper@nifa.usda.gov.

PART VIII—OTHER INFORMATION

A. Access to Review Information

Copies of reviews, not including the identity of reviewers, and a summary of the panel comments will be sent to the applicant PD after the review process has been completed.

B. Use of Funds; Changes

1. Delegation of Fiscal Responsibility

Unless the terms and conditions of the award state otherwise, the awardee may not in whole or in part delegate or transfer to another person, institution, or organization the responsibility for use or expenditure of award funds.

2. Changes in Project Plans

a. The permissible changes by the awardee, PD(s), or other key project personnel in the approved project shall be limited to changes in methodology, techniques, or other similar aspects of the project to expedite achievement of the project's approved goals. If the awardee or the PD(s) is uncertain as to whether a change complies with this provision, the question must be referred to the Authorized Departmental Officer (ADO) for a final determination. The ADO is the signatory of the award document, not the program contact.

b. Changes in approved goals or objectives shall be requested by the awardee and approved in writing by the ADO prior to effecting such changes. In no event shall requests for such changes be approved which are outside the scope of the original approved project.

c. Changes in approved project leadership or the replacement or reassignment of other key project personnel shall be requested by the awardee and approved in writing by the ADO prior to effecting such changes.

d. Transfers of actual performance of the substantive programmatic work in whole or in part and provisions for payment of funds, whether or not Federal funds are involved, shall be requested by the awardee and approved in writing by the ADO prior to effecting such transfers, unless prescribed otherwise in the terms and conditions of the award.

e. The project period may be extended by NIFA without additional financial support, for such additional period(s) as the ADO determines may be necessary to complete or fulfill the purposes of an approved project, but in no case shall the total project period exceed any applicable statutory limit or expiring appropriation limitation. Any extension of time shall be conditioned upon prior request by the awardee and approval in writing by the ADO, unless prescribed otherwise in the terms and conditions of award.

f. Changes in Approved Budget: Unless stated otherwise in the terms and conditions of award, changes in an approved budget must be requested by the awardee and approved in writing by the

ADO prior to instituting such changes, if the revision will involve transfers or expenditures of amounts requiring prior approval as set forth in the applicable Federal cost principles, Departmental regulations, or award.

C. Confidential Aspects of Applications and Awards

When an application results in an award, it becomes a part of the record of NIFA transactions, available to the public upon specific request. Information that the Secretary determines to be of a confidential, privileged, or proprietary nature will be held in confidence to the extent permitted by law. Therefore, any information that the applicant wishes to have considered as confidential, privileged, or proprietary should be clearly marked within the application. The original copy of an application that does not result in an award will be retained by the Agency for a period of three years. Other copies will be destroyed. Such an application will be released only with the consent of the applicant or to the extent required by law. An application may be withdrawn at any time prior to the final action thereon.

D. Regulatory Information

For the reasons set forth in the final Rule related Notice to 7 CFR part 3015, subpart V (48 FR 29114, June 24, 1983), this program is excluded from the scope of the Executive Order 12372 which requires intergovernmental consultation with State and local officials. Under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. chapter 35), the collection of information requirements contained in this Notice have been approved under OMB Document No. 0524-0039.

E. Definitions

Please refer to 7 CFR 3430, Competitive and Noncompetitive Non-Formula Federal Assistance Programs--General Award Administrative Provisions, for the applicable definitions for this NIFA grant program (Web link: [7 CFR 3430 General definitions](#)).

For the purpose of this program, the following additional definitions are applicable:

IPM Collaboration(s) refer to a section of a program proposal that contains a component of collaboration with another institution: (1) in which an applicant institution includes a cooperative element with at least one other entity that is not legally affiliated with the applicant institution; and (2) where the applicant institution and each cooperating entity will assume a significant role in the implementation of the proposed collaborative program component. Funds need not be subcontracted in all cases, and may be administered by the applicant institution. Only the applicant institution must meet the definition of an eligible institution as specified in this RFA.

IPM Coordinator(s) refers to the individual(s) with programmatic lead responsibilities at institutions with IPM programs. Programs may exist with or without funding from this program, but in reference to this program, the term is used to identify the individual responsible for executing the institutional IPM program funded through EIPM-CS Coordination Program.

New continuation grant - A new continuation grant is an award for a successful project application that has not been previously submitted, and by which the Department agrees to support a specified level of effort for a predetermined project period with a statement of intention to provide additional support at a future date, contingent upon the availability of appropriated funds and the satisfactory progress of this project, and the determination that continued support would be in the best interest of the Federal government and the public.